



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/591,790

12/11/2006

Rudi Kraus

2004P02085

4511

24131 7590 09/15/2008  
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP  
P O BOX 2480  
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

DUNN, DARRIN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/15/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/591,790	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KRAUS, RUDI	
	<b>Examiner</b> DARRIN DUNN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/19/07   11/22/06</u> .                                     | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is responsive to the communication filed on 12/11/2006.
2. Claims 25-56 are pending in the application.

### ***Priority***

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been received.

4. It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. PCT/EP2005/050889 (filed 03/05/2005) and to German application No. DE 2004 011 201.0 (filed 03/04/2004), appearing in applicant's OATH. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence(s) of the specification of this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121, or 365(c). See 37 CFR 1.78(a). For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of all nonprovisional applications. If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference to the prior application must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the

Art Unit: 2121

date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A benefit claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

If the reference to the prior application was previously submitted within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 1.78(a), but not in the first sentence(s) of the specification or an application data sheet (ADS) as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a) (e.g., if the reference was submitted in an oath or declaration or the application transmittal letter), and the information concerning the benefit claim was recognized by the Office as shown by its inclusion on the first filing receipt, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a) and the surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t) are not required. Applicant is still required to submit the reference in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78(a) by filing an amendment to the first sentence(s) of the specification or an ADS. See MPEP § 201.11.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 11/19/2007 and 11/22/2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner. It is noted that the IDS appears to be a duplicate submission.

### ***Specification***

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

#### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino

Art Unit: 2121

acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

6. The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading difficult. New application papers with lines 1½ or double spaced on good quality paper are required.

7. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 54 recites a virtual environment. Applicant's instant specification states that "such systems can be operated in a virtual environment using the possibilities of 'adaptive computing'..."the invention provides for the information to relate to hardware...and/or distributed application systems having virtualized services"...it is possible for at least one application to be operated in a virtual environment without fixed hardware assignment." It is unclear how applicant is defining a virtual environment and/or virtual services.

### ***Claim Objections***

8. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: A method claim is recited that begins with the terminology "with a central program means stored in a data processing device." It is improper claim construction to recite a structure without a corresponding step. It is recommended to phrase the language as "processing system related data with a central program means..." Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 28 recites "wishes having been input." The claim is not grammatically correct.

10. Claim 31 recites "selected from the group of clients." It appears the claim terminology is not in a proper Markush format.

Art Unit: 2121

11. Claim 32 recites “starting, stopping, and adding services....and maintenance of distributed hardware.” It appears the claim terminology is not in a proper Markush format.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claim 29 recites the limitation "the operating plans," "the information," and "the operating state." Claim 29 depends upon claim 25. Claim 25 does not provide antecedent basis for the above limitations.

14. Claim 30 recites “the central processing device.” Claim 25 recites “central processing means.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for central processing device.

15. Claim 39 recites “the system level.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for the claim terminology.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2121

17. Claims 1-41 and 44-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Natarajan et al. (USPN 6769024).

18. As per claim 1, Natarajan et al. teaches a method for managing and monitoring an operation of a plurality of distributed hardware and/or software systems that are integrated into at least one communications network ([ABSTRACT], [FIG 2]), the method which comprises:

with a central program means – 254 ([COL 13 lines 22-34] e.g., policy engine) stored in a data processing device – ([COL 13 lines 38-42) , processing system-related data that are present in the data processing device ([COL 13 lines 35-45] e.g., policy engine is a decision making component of the feedback-based adaptive network....making decisions based upon measured variables and conditions) or are received by the data processing device via a communications network ([COL 13 lines 22-45 e.g., updated network conditions power the policy engine in turn effecting changes in the network);

autonomously deriving operation-related decisions from the data ([COL 13 lines 35-45];

based on the decisions, generating decision-specific control data for influencing the operation of one or more hardware and/or software systems ([COL 13 lines 35-49] e.g., policy engine implements a corrective action to restore the network element to a predetermined state); and

transmitting the control data, via the communications network, to data processing devices assigned to the respective hardware and/or software systems ([COL 13 lines 35-49] e.g., policy engine employed in adaptive feedback network where corrective actions restore the network element to a pre-determined state, i.e., transmitting control data to data processing devices, i.e., elements).



Art Unit: 2121

19. As per claim 26 Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the central program means accesses at least one set of data stored in the data processing device ([COL 14 lines 1-10] e.g., policy modules represents sets of data) and selected from the group consisting of rule data –[COL 14 lines 19-25] e.g. rule based policies), performance data ([COL 14 line 5] e.g., traffic shaping policies) , grouping data ([COL 14 lines 5-10] e.g., SLA policies) , classification data ([COL 14 lines 5-10] e.g., security policies), and availability data ([COL 14 lines 5-10] e.g., dial-up policies, i.e., inferred as allowing or denying dial up to occur)

20. As per claim 27, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 26, wherein the rule data comprise rules regarding priorities and/or sequences and/or logical ([COL 14 lines 15-20] e.g., controlling CIR parameters) and/or temporal relationships ([COL 14 lines 15-20] e.g., frame relay/timing (e.g., temporal relationships), and the performance data relate to a current operational load and/or a temporally restricted and/or dynamic and/or periodically needed capacity requirement (e.g., traffic shaping policies, i.e., load | dial up policies, i.e., temporal/time restrictions and or security policies)

21. As per claim 28, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the system-related data are selected from the group consisting of operating plans ([COL 13 lines 4-5] e.g., application specific policy plug-in modules. It is interpreted that a policy is an operating plan) information regarding operating states of individual systems ([COL 13 lines 25-32] e.g., updated network data), and operator's wishes having been input at a central and/or individual system level using an input device.

22. As per claim 29, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the operating plans regulate run times and availability of individual hardware and/or software

Art Unit: 2121

systems ([COL 14 lines 1-10] e.g., policies regulate security (e.g., availability), frame relay (e.g., run time), and the information regarding the operating state of individual systems relate to a current and/or future and/or periodic workload ([COL 13 lines 25-30] e.g., updated network conditions (e.g., current conditions)

23. As per claim 30, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 29, which comprises receiving, with the central data processing device, the information regarding the operating state of individual systems in an active and/or passive manner ([COL 13 lines 35-36] e.g., feedback based, i.e., active manner)

24. As per claim 31, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 29, wherein the information relates to hardware selected from the group of clients, servers, networks, and storage systems ([COL 6 lines 41-45] e.g., network elements) and/or to software selected from the group of applications, distributed applications having services that are dependent on one another, distributed application systems having virtualized services that are dependent on one another and/or independent of one another, and/or databases, and/or front ends ([COL 7 lines 27-29] e.g., software components)

25. As per claim 32, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the control data are configured to control at least one operation selected from the group consisting of starting, stopping, and adding services, moving services, moving applications, and maintenance of a distributed hardware and/or software system ([COL 8 lines 40-45], [COL 13 lines 45-50] e.g., corrective action, i.e., maintenance)

Art Unit: 2121

26. As per claim 33, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the operation-related decisions include determining administrative tasks and/or chains of task ([COL 18 lines 33-35] ,[COL 27 lines 59-67])

27. As per claim 34, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 33, which comprises, with the central program means, autonomously separating administrative tasks and/or chains of tasks into subtasks taking ([FIG 11] e.g., policy engine sub-tasks) into account logical and/or temporal relationships and/or dynamic influences and/or availability data (e.g., read node – yes or no, i.e., availability) and/or priorities (e.g., ordered flow, i.e., 1108 -1110-1112) and/or grouping data and/or classification data and/or application data that are present in the data processing device.

28. As per claim 35, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 33, which comprises, with the central program means, autonomously separating administrative tasks and/or chains of tasks into subtasks for moving and/or replacing application entities (FIG 10 – elements 1000-1006] e.g., updating network element, i.e., replacing application entities)

29. As per claim 36, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 33, which comprises checking, with the central program means, a temporal progression of the administrative tasks and/or chains of tasks that are transmitted to the individual hardware and/or software systems in the form of control data ([FIG 10 – elements 1002, i.e., checking)

30. As per claim 37, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 36, which comprises configuring the central program means to check continuously ([FIG 10] e.g., loop, i.e., continuously) and/or at particular intervals of time.

Art Unit: 2121

31. As per claim 38, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, which comprises assigning at least some of the distributed hardware and/or software systems their own autonomous program means that are stored in data processing devices in the form of autonomous agents that are subordinate to the central program means ([COL 7 lines 50-60] e.g., monitor/agent)

32. As per claim 39, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 38, which comprises accessing, with the autonomous agent of an individual hardware and/or software system, rule data that are prescribed at the system level in the data processing devices ([COL 7 lines 60-67] e.g., network element automatically configures itself utilizing the updated control information, i.e., rule data)

33. As per claim 40, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 39, wherein the rule data prescribed at the system level in the data processing devices comprise rules for the individual system and/or the interaction with the central autonomous program means ([COL 7 lines 60-67] e.g., , updated control data corresponds to centralized control information, i.e., rule data)

34. As per claim 41, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 39, which comprises interchanging control and/or rule data via the communications networks between the central program means and the autonomous agents of the individual hardware and/or software systems ([COL 7 lines 60-67] e.g., receiving updated control information)

35. As per claim 44, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 39, wherein the autonomous agents of the individual hardware and/or software systems respectively transmit general and/or system-specific control data to the data processing device of the central program

Art Unit: 2121

means via a communications network ([COL 7 lines 55-56] e.g., reporting information to data store, i.e., central system) and/or publish the data in generally accessible file systems and/or collaborate in a separation of administrative tasks and/or chains of tasks into subtasks.

36. As per claim 45, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, which comprises operating the central program means in different operating modes ([FIG 5C – event handler mode, policy server mode])

37. As per claim 46, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 45, which comprises operating the central program means in at least one operating mode selected from the group consisting of fully autonomous mode ([COL 21 lines 10-14]) , partially autonomous mode ([COL 21 – 42-46] e.g., ADMIN corresponds to partial user interaction, i.e., partially autonomous), and with different reaction speeds.

38. As per claim 47, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 45, which comprises operating the central program means in partially autonomous mode and changing and/or interrupting the partially autonomous mode with a manual input on an input device by an authorized administrator ([COL 28 lines 27-38] e.g., system administrator modifies policy, i.e., interrupting mode with a manual input)

39. As per claim 48, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 45, which comprises operating the central program means in partially autonomous mode and changing and/or interrupting the partially autonomous mode by the autonomous agents of the individual systems ([COL 28 lines 27-30] e.g., remote user dynamically modifies policy, wherein such remote user is understood as being local to a network element comprising an agent)

Art Unit: 2121

40. As per claim 49, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the central program means includes a notification component ([FIG 5C- element 254f), and the notification component outputs information regarding substeps ([FIG 9A – elements 900A, 902, 904) of the work of the central program means and/or the processing state thereof via an output device.

41. As per claim 50, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the distributed hardware and/or software systems comprise at least one application system ([COL 7 lines 27-35] e.g., software control components)

42. As per claim 51, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 50, wherein the at least one application system comprises a plurality of entities each controlling at least one service ([COL 7 lines 27-35] e.g., policy engine, for example, comprises multiple entities, i.e., event notification, policy server, and plug-ins. In addition, policy engine further provides services provided via plug-in modules).

43. As per claim 52, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 51, wherein the at least one service is selected from the group of interactive mode ([FIG 5C – event handler, i.e., interactive mode), batch mode ([COL 8 lines 14-20] e.g., local cache), accounting services ([COL 14 lines SLA policies) , printing services, messaging services, and network services ([COL 14 lines] QoS.)

44. As per claim 53, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claims 51, wherein a plurality of application systems cooperate in a system family – network ([FIG 2])

Art Unit: 2121

45. As per claim 54, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 50, which comprises operating the at least one application system in a virtual environment without fixed hardware assignment ([COL 5 lines 35-40] e.g., virtual environment, i.e., virtual circuit)

46. As per claim 55, Natarajan et al. teaches the method according to claim 25, wherein the distributed hardware and/or software systems comprise client/server systems and/or operating systems ([FIG 2])

47. As per claim 56, Natarajan et al. teaches a system for managing and monitoring an operation of a plurality of distributed systems selected from the group consisting of hardware systems and software systems integrated into at least one communications network, the system comprising:

a data processing device ([FIG 2- element 254]), and at least one of a central autonomous program means stored in said data processing device ([FIG 5C – element 254f | 254b) and autonomous agents ([COL 7 lines 50-60] e.g., agents), stored in data processing devices ([FIG 2] e.g., computing elements), for individual hardware and/or software systems and/or input and/or output devices at a central system level and/or an individual system level, and configured to carry out the method according to claim 25 ([ABSTRACT])

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

48. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2121

49. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

50. Claims 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natarajan et al. (USPN 6769024) in view of Pawar et al. (USPN 20030033400)

51. As per claim 42, Natarajan et al. teaches a central program means but fails to teach selectively granting and withdrawing decision making powers to the autonomous agents. Pawar et al. teaches configuring an agent to schedule a target to be executed, i.e., granting decision powers ([0041-46])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to enable an agent to control a particular process. Pawar et al. teaches a method system for network management employing remote agents. Natarajan et al. teaches a feedback adaptive network utilizing remote agents to report network information. Since an agent may report its information at particular intervals, it would have been beneficial to provide the agent with a schedule to regulate reporting intervals.

52. As per claim 43, Pawar et al. teaches the method according to claim 39, which comprises granting and withdrawing the decision-making powers permanently, temporally restricted, or dynamically ([0052 – administrator may attach multiple schedules to a single target in which an agent is running, i.e., dynamically)



***Conclusion***

53. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5781703 – intelligent remote agent for computer monitoring

6405250 – predictive monitoring

6662207 – agent system and information processing method for same

6671724 – software and methods for managing a distributed network

6751661 – method and system for providing intelligent network management

7058953 – managing a distributed computing system

20020085571 – enhanced SNMP

20030126501 – system and method for using agent based distributed case based reasoning to manage a computer network

20040122645 – method and apparatus for simulating computer networks

20040153545 – systems and methods for managing a distributed network

20050132032 – agent based system management

20060023741 – adaptive control of a network element

20070132846 – adaptive network and method

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARRIN DUNN whose telephone number is (571)270-1645.

The examiner can normally be reached on EST:M-R(8:00-5:00) 9/5/4.

Art Unit: 2121

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DD  
09/10/08

/Albert DeCady/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2121